REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 14-17, 19-26, 29, 35-44, and 58-65 are pending[1]. Claims 1, 15, and 35 have been amended to improve their clarity.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9-11, 14-16, 20, 22, 25, 26, 35, 36, 38, 40, 43, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,732,349 to Sanpei et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,085,098 to Moon et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a system for updating information stored in a memory of a portable electronic device." The system includes "a plurality of base stations, each of said plurality of base stations being located at a respective geographic location and transmitting a radio signal including information specific to said respective geographic location," and "a transceiver in said portable electronic device." The transceiver is "arranged and configured such that when said portable electronic device comes into range of one of said plurality of base stations, said portable electronic device automatically receives said radio signal from said one of said plurality of base stations, said information is received by said transceiver and provided to a microprocessor in said portable electronic device, and based on said information in said radio signal updates said information stored in said memory of said portable electronic device, without a determination of portable electronic device location and whether said information should be updated."

Sanpei et al. discloses a portable telephone communication system in which communication begins when a calling telephone transmits a channel connection request to a corresponding base station connected to a network. The telephone transmits the request in response to a function key pressed by a user. Thus, communication in the Sanpei et al. system is initiated by the user. Sanpei et al. does not teach or suggest "a system for updating information stored in a memory of a portable electronic device" in which the portable electronic device is arranged and configured such that when it "comes into range

[1] Claim number inconsistencies appear in items 4, 6 of the Office Action Summary.

of one of said plurality of base stations, said portable electronic device *automatically* receives said radio signal from said one of said plurality of base stations, said information is received by said transceiver and provided to a microprocessor in said portable electronic device, and based on said information in said radio signal said information stored in said memory of said portable electronic device is updated, without a determination being made as to whether said information should be updated."

Moon et al. discloses a portable communications device in which location information is updated, but only after a user initiates a function and several other steps are taken. First, a user selects a function in which a software program requests certain geographical information (box 60 of Fig. 5). These steps are followed by at least three separate determination steps: First the device determines its current location. Then, a determination is made as to whether there is an active voice conversation underway. Depending on the outcome of that decision, a third determination is made regarding either the geographical location of the other party to the conversation, or the location of the most recent voice conversation. See Fig. 5. Only after these steps of user initiation, software request, and the three determinations does the device "automatically" configure settings. Thus, Moon et al. does not teach or suggest a system in which a portable device transceiver is "arranged and configured such that when said portable electronic device comes into range of one of said plurality of base stations, said portable electronic device automatically receives said radio signal from said one of said plurality of base stations, said information is received by said transceiver and provided to a microprocessor in said portable electronic device." Further, a fundamental feature of the device disclosed by Moon et al. is the determination of current geographical location. This can be done from a global positioning satellite, mapping a cell site, or examining a forward control channel, for example. See col. 5, lines 47-57. Moon et al. does not teach or suggest "a system for updating information stored in a memory of a portable electronic device" in which "information stored in said memory of said portable electronic device is updated *without a determination* of portable electronic device *location* and whether said information should be updated."

Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references to Sanpei et al. and Moon et al. Claims 2-11, 14, and 58-61 depend from claim 1, and are patentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Moon et al. for at least the same reasons.

Further, with respect to dependent claim 2, Applicants note that Sanpei et al. and Moon et al. both require a user to initiate communication, by selecting a function key, for example. Thus, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that "said update of said location dependent information stored in said memory of said portable electronic device is done automatically without any intervention from a user."

Claim 15 recites a portable electronic device that includes "a processor," "a memory coupled to said processor, said memory storing information," and "a receiver coupled to said processor, said receiver being arranged and configured to automatically receive radio signals, said radio signals including information specific to a geographic location, and to provide said information specific to said geographic location to said processor," "wherein said processor is arranged and configured to update said location dependent information stored in said memory based on said location specific information in response to automatically receiving said location specific information from said receiver," "without a determination of a portable electronic device location and whether said information should be updated."

The combination of Sanpei et al. in view of Moon et al. does not render obvious the subject matter of claim 15 for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to similar limitations in claim 1. Accordingly, claims 15, and its dependent claims 16, 17, 19-26, 29, 62, and 63, are patentable over the proposed combination of Sanpei et al. in view of Moon et al.

Further, with respect to dependent claim 16, Applicants note that Sanpei et al. and Moon et al. both require a user to initiate communication, by selecting a function key, for example. Thus, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that "said update of said

location dependent information stored in said memory of said portable electronic device is done automatically without any intervention from a user."

Claim 35 recites "a method for updating location dependent information stored in a memory of a portable electronic device." The method comprises steps of "receiving a radio signal automatically from a base station when said portable electronic device comes into range of said base station, said radio signal including location specific information specific to a geographic location in which said base station is situated," and "updating said location dependent information stored in said memory based on said location specific information without a determination of portable electronic device location and whether said information should be updated."

Claim 35 is directed to a method of operating a portable electronic device and has been amended to recite that location dependent information stored in memory is updated "without a determination of portable electronic device location and whether said information should be updated." The combination of Sanpei et al. in view of Moon et al. does not render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 35 for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to similar limitations of claims 1 and 15. Claims 35, and its dependent claims 36-44, 64, and 65, are patentable over the proposed combination of the Sanpei et al. and Pfeffer et al. references.

Further, with respect to dependent claim 36, Applicants note that Sanpei et al. and Moon et al. both require a user to initiate communication, by selecting a function key, for example. Thus, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that "said updating of said location dependent information stored in said memory of said portable electronic device is done automatically without any intervention from a user."

Claims 5, 21, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Moon et al., further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,282,431 to Konno. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, claim 21 depends from claim 15, and claim 39 depends from claim 35. As discussed above, each of the independent claims 1, 15, and 35 is patentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Moon et al. Konno has not been asserted against claims 1, 15, and 35, and in any event would not cure the deficiencies of Sanpei et al. in view of Moon at al. Claims 5, 21, and 39 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 15, and 35, respectively.

Claims 3, 7, 17, 19, 23, 37, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Moon et al. and in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,305,372 to Tomiyori.[2] Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 3 and 7 depend from claim 1, claims 17, 19 and 23 depend from claim 15, and claims 37 and 41 depend from claim 35. As discussed above, each of the pending independent claims 1, 15, and 35 is patentable over the combination of Sanpei et al. in view of Pfeffer et al. Accordingly, claims 3, 7, 17, 19, 23, 37, and 41 are allowable for at least the reasons given for the allowance of claims 1, 15, and 35.

Claims 8, 24, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sanpei et al. in view of Moon et al. and in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,201,963 to Nakamura. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1, claim 24 depends from claim 15, and claim 42 depends from claim 35. As discussed above, each of the independent claims 1, 15, and 35 is patentable over the references to Sanpei et al. and Pfeffer et al. Accordingly, claims 8, 24, and 42 are allowable for at least the reasons given above for the allowance of claims 1, 15, and 35.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action contains a rejection of claims 12, 13, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 46, 49-50, 53, 54, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). These claims are no longer pending, having previously been canceled.

[2] Claim 18, canceled by Applicants' previous response, is listed as rejected in the Office Action.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action contains a rejection of claims 34 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). These claims are no longer pending, having previously been canceled.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action contains a rejection of claims 32, 47, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). These claims are no longer pending, having previously been canceled.

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action contains a rejection of claims 33 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). These claims are no longer pending, having previously been canceled.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: November 12 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By_____

Thomas J. D'Amico
Registration No.: 28,371
Peter McGee
Registration No.: 35,947
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526
(202) 785-9700
Attorneys for Applicant